PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference a1533-167-I	**FOR FURTHER ACTION**	See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/PEA/416)
International application No. PCT/IL 03/00760	International filing date *(day/month/year)* 24.09.2003	Priority date *(day/month/year)* 30.09.2002

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04L12/58

Applicant CORPOSOFT LTD.

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.

   ☒ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

   These annexes consist of a total of 9 sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

I	☒	Basis of the opinion
II	☐	Priority
III	☐	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
IV	☐	Lack of unity of invention
V	☒	Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
VI	☐	Certain documents cited
VII	☐	Certain defects in the international application
VIII	☐	Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 28.04.2004	Date of completion of this report 19.11.2004
Name and mailing address of the International preliminary examining authority: European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016	Authorized Officer Ströbeck, A. Telephone No. +31 70 340-1011

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application *(Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17))*:

Description, Pages

1, 4, 5, 7-17, 19-25	as originally filed
2, 2a, 6, 18	filed with telefax on 14.09.2004
3	filed with telefax on 09.11.2004

Claims, Numbers

1-23	filed with telefax on 09.11.2004

Drawings, Sheets

1/9-9/9	as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language,** all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

  – These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

    ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

    ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

    ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

    ☐ contained in the international application in written form.

    ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

    ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

    ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

    ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

    ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

    ☐ the description,   pages:

    ☐ the claims,   Nos.:

    ☐ the drawings,   sheets:

5. ☐   This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have
been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

*(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this
report.)*

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

**V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes:	Claims	3,4,6,7,10,13,14,16,17
	No:	Claims	1,2,5,8,9,11,12,15,18-23
Inventive step (IS)	Yes:	Claims	
	No:	Claims	1-23
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-23
	No:	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

   see separate sheet

<u>Re Item V</u>
Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1.   The subject-matter of independent **claims 1, 19, 22 and 23** is not novel (**Article 33(2) PCT**).

1.1   Referring to claim 1, document **D1=US-2002/0071546-A** discloses a method of assigning importance classes to electronic messages comprising:
        identifying the sender of an electronic message (par. [0038]);
        identifying the recipient of the electronic message (par. [0038]);
        determining a relative organizational distance between the sender and the recipient (par. [0040]);
        assigning the electronic message an importance class as a function of the relative organizational distance between the sender and the recipient (par. [0042]), said function being independent of which of the sender or the recipient is of higher rank (par. [0040]).

To clarify that the importance is independent of the rank the following is put forward. In paragraph [0040] it is clear that one way of assigning importance to a message is by calculating an organisational distance between the sender and the recipient. Although this distance is related to a common superior of the sender and recipient and, hence, depends on the rank of this superior in relation to the ranks of the sender and the recipient, it is **independent** of the sender or the recipient being of higher rank. The distance is merely and addition of the number of links between the two users irrespective of which one of them being the sender and the recipient (see lines 4 - 6 of paragraph [0040]).

1.2   System claim 19, program storage claim 22 and program product claim 23 correspond to method claim 1 and a corresponding line of thought is applicable.

2.   Dependent **claims 2 - 18, 20 and 21** do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step.

2.1   D1 discloses the analysis of e-mail headers for prioritizing e-mail (claims 2, 5 and

20), priority rules related to different hierarchical levels (claim 8 and 21), sorting and displaying priority tags (claims 9, 11 and 12), performing the prioritizing function on locally-stored mail (claim 15) and representing the organisation structure using graphics (claim 18).

2.2   Referring to claims 6, 7 and 17, it is known to apply priority functions to different kinds of electronic messages and to use different folders for messages with differing priorities (see e.g. D2=WO-01/80535-A).

2.3   Referring to claims 3 and 10, it is known to prioritize mail depending on its content and to display mail with different priorities using different colours (see e.g. D3=GB-2 353 679-A).

2.4   Referring to claims 13, 14 and 16, it is known to block low priority mail and notify the sender and to selectively transmit mail from a server (see e.g. D4=US-6 334 140-B).

2.5   Referring to claim 4, it is known to prioritize mail by analysing user actions (see e.g. D5=EP-0 999 507-A).